

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.
SUMNER SQUARE
1615 M STREET, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-3215

(202) 326-7900
FACSIMILE:
(202) 326-7999

June 1, 2015

The Honorable Denise L. Cote
United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
Daniel Patrick Moynihan U.S. Courthouse
500 Pearl Street
New York, NY 10007

Re: *DNAML Pty, Limited v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 13 Civ. 6516 (DLC)
Diesel eBooks, LLC v. Apple, Inc. et al., 14 Civ. 1768 (DLC)
Abbey House Media, Inc. v. Apple, Inc. et al., 14 Civ. 2000 (DLC)

Dear Judge Cote:

Plaintiff DNAML writes to inform the Court that DNAML and the Defendants have come to agreement regarding a framework for discovery related to the issues raised in Defendants' letter of April 27, 2015, *DNAML* Dkt. 118, pursuant to the guidance from the Court given on the telephone conference of May 20, 2015. The terms of the parties' agreement are set forth in Exhibit 1.

Because the resolution of the discovery dispute (the "Projection Dispute") necessarily impacts the remaining expert discovery and summary judgment motions, DNAML respectfully requests that certain deadlines in the schedule attached to the Joint Initial Report entered by the Court on September 4, 2014, *DNAML* Dkt. 91, be modified. The proposed schedule postpones the remaining expert discovery and summary judgment briefing until after the resolution of the Projection Dispute, but then will proceed upon the same timeline as set forth in the original schedule. Plaintiffs Diesel and Abbey House and all Defendants have authorized counsel for DNAML to state that they consent to this request provided that all three cases remain on the same schedule.

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.

The Honorable Denise L. Cote
 June 1, 2015
 Page 2

Plaintiffs' rebuttal expert reports served	Fourteen calendar days after resolution of the Projection Dispute ¹
End of expert discovery, including expert depositions	Four weeks after resolution of the Projection dispute
Letters containing list of topics on which the parties will move for summary judgment filed	Two weeks after the end of expert discovery
Summary judgment motions filed	Four weeks after the end of expert discovery
Summary judgment motion oppositions filed	Seven weeks after the end of expert discovery
Summary judgment motion replies filed	Nine weeks after the end of expert discovery

¹ The resolution of the Projection Dispute will be deemed to occur either when Defendants state that they do not plan to file any motions related to the Projection Dispute or the Court resolves all outstanding motions related to the Projection Dispute.

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.

The Honorable Denise L. Cote
June 1, 2015
Page 3

Respectfully Submitted,

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS
& FIGEL, PLLC

By: 

Michael J. Guzman (*pro hac vice*)
Derek T. Ho (DH0104)
Sumner Square
1615 M St. NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202)326-7910
mguzman@khhte.com
dho@khhte.com

On behalf of Plaintiff DNAML PTY, Limited

cc: Counsel of Record (via ECF Notification)